

REMARKS

Claims 1-23 are pending in the application. Claims 18-23 have been withdrawn from consideration. In the Final Office Action mailed April 21, 2008, the Examiner took the following action: rejected Claims 1-17 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Anderson (Lab Testing of Neural Networks for Improved Aircraft Onboard-Diagnostics on Flight-Ready Software, 1993). Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

I. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Anderson. Claims 2-17 depend from Claim 1. Claim 1 recites:

1. A method of operating a product, comprising:
monitoring a first diagnostic information of a mechanical component included in a flight control system of the product;
monitoring a second diagnostic information of the flight control system of the product, wherein the second diagnostic information is independent of the first diagnostic information;
combining the first diagnostic information of the mechanical component and the second diagnostic information of the flight control system; and
automatically reconfiguring at least one of the mechanical component and the flight control system to compensate if the combined first and second diagnostic information indicates a degradation of the mechanical component.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. First, Anderson does not recite as claimed in Claim 1, "monitoring a first diagnostic information of *a mechanical component* included in a flight control system of the product." (Emphasis added).

Instead, Anderson discloses that "if a high acceleration load factor is present when Relay #1 triggers, a casual relationship is established in the output signal that may be valuable in the diagnosis of the system functions." (Page 406, Left Column, Lines 8-11; Figure 3). However,

the disclosure of Anderson does not teach or suggest that either the “high acceleration load factor” or the triggering of “Relay #1” includes diagnostic information from a *mechanical component* included in a flight control system, as claimed in Claim 1.

It is well established that a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). MPEP § 2131.

In this instance, there is nothing in Anderson that specifically discloses that “Relay #1” conveys information from either a “mechanical component” or a “flight control system” that includes the “mechanical component.” Additionally, Anderson also does not specifically disclose that “Relay #2”, as shown in Figure 3 of Anderson, conveys information from either a “mechanical component” or a “flight control system” that includes the “mechanical component.” Likewise, there is nothing in Anderson that specifically discloses that the “high acceleration load factor” is from a “mechanical component” or a “flight control system” that includes the “mechanical component”. Indeed, Anderson discloses that “neural network”, which includes the “load acceleration factor” and the “Relay #1”, is used to diagnose computer failures. (Page 406, Left Column, Lines 16-18; Figure 4). Thus, this element of Claim 1 is not anticipated by Anderson.

Second, Anderson does not recite as claimed in Claim 1, “monitoring a second diagnostic information of *the flight control system* of the product, wherein the second diagnostic information is independent of the first diagnostic information.” (Emphasis added).

Instead, Anderson discloses that “if a high acceleration load factor is present when Relay #1 triggers, a casual relationship is established in the output signal that may be valuable in the diagnosis of the system functions.” (Page 406, Left Column, Lines 8-11; Figure 3). However, the disclosure of Anderson does not teach or suggest that either the “high acceleration load

factor” or the triggering of “Relay #1” includes diagnostic information from a *flight control system*, as claimed in Claim 1.

Once again, there is nothing in Anderson that specifically discloses that “Relay #1” conveys information from a “flight control system” that includes a “mechanical component.” Additionally, Anderson also does not specifically disclose that “Relay #2”, as shown in Figure 3 of Anderson, conveys information from a “flight control system” that includes a “mechanical component.” Likewise, there is nothing in Anderson that specifically discloses that the “high acceleration load factor” is from a “flight control system” that includes a “mechanical component”. Thus, this element of Claim 1 is also not anticipated by Anderson.

Third, since Anderson does not disclose the above mentioned elements of Claim 1, Anderson also cannot recite, “combining the first diagnostic information of the *mechanical component* and the second diagnostic information of the *flight control system*,” as claimed in Claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited reference to Anderson does not recite the method claimed in Claim 1. Thus, Claim 1 is allowable over Anderson. Furthermore, because Claims 2-17 depend from Claim 1, they are also allowable for at least the same reason that Claim 1 is allowable. Further, the additional elements in dependent Claims 2-17 provide limitations that are not taught by Anderson. Although all dependent claims recite limitations not taught by Anderson, only Claim 9 is further discussed below.

Specifically, Anderson does not recite, “reconfiguring *both the mechanical component and the flight control system* to compensate during a flight if the combined first and second diagnostic information indicates a degradation of the mechanical component,” as claimed in Claim 9. (Emphasis added).

Instead, Anderson discloses that when its damage detection network identifies that a control surface is damaged, the network uses the information to “reconfiguring the *remaining* flight control surfaces to restore safe flight.” Since Anderson discloses the reconfiguration of

"remaining flight control surfaces," Anderson cannot disclose reconfiguring a degraded or damaged control surface.


Accordingly, Anderson does not recite, "reconfiguring *both the mechanical component and the flight control system* to compensate during a flight if the combined first and second diagnostic information indicates a *degradation of the mechanical component*," as claimed in Claim 9. (Emphasis added). Thus, Claim 9 is further allowable.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully request that the above-proposed amendments be entered and that pending claims 1-17 be allowed. If there are any remaining matters that may be handled by telephone conference, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: 8-18-08

By: 
Elliott Y. Chen
Lee & Hayes, PLLC
Reg. No. 58,293
(206) 315-7914